1	Reza Mirzaie (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)	
2	<u>rmirzaie@raklaw.com</u> Marc A. Fenster (<i>Admitted Pro Hac Vice</i>)	
2	mfenster@raklaw.com	
3	Adam S. Hoffman (<i>Admitted Pro Hac Vice</i>) ahoffman@raklaw.com	
4	Shani M. Tutt (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)	
5	stutt@raklaw. <i>com</i> Brian D. Ledahl (<i>Admitted Pro Hac Vice</i>)	
)	<u>bledahl@raklaw.com</u>	
6	C. Jay Chung (Admitted Pro Hac Vice) jchung@raklaw.com	
7	RUSS, AUGUST & KABAT	
8	12424 Wilshire Boulevard, 12th Floor Los Angeles, California 90025	
	Telephone: (310) 826-7474 Facsimile: (310) 826-6991	
9	1 acsimile. (310) 820-0331	
10	Mark Borghese	
11	Nevada Bar No. 6231	
12	mark@borgheselegal.com Borghese Legal, Ltd.	
	10161 Park Run Drive, Suite 150	
13	Las Vegas, NV 89145 Telephone: (702) 382-0200	
14	Facsimile: (702) 382-0212	
15	Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counterdefendant, 2-WAY COMPUTING, INC.	
16	IN THE UNITED STAT	TES DISTRICT COURT
17	FOR THE DISTR	ICT OF NEVADA
18	2-WAY COMPUTING, INC., a Nevada corporation,	Case No.: 2:11-cv-00012-JCM-(PAL)
19	Plaintiff,	2-WAY COMPUTING, INC.'S
20	V.	UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE UNDER SEAL
	NEXTEL FINANCE COMPANY, a Delaware corporation; SPRINT UNITED	FILE UNDER SEAL
21	MANAGEMENT COMPANY, a Kansas	
22	corporation; SPRINT SOLUTIONS, INC., a Delaware corporation, NEXTEL OF	
23	CALIFORNIA, INC., a Delaware	
24	corporation, NEXTEL BOOST OF CALIFORNIA, LLC, a Delaware limited	
	liability company, and NEXTEL	
25	COMMUNICATIONS, INC., a Delaware corporation, Defendants.	
26		
27		
·		

Pursuant to Local Rule 10-5 and Paragraph 9 of the Stipulated Protective Order (Docket No. 39), Plaintiff 2-Way Computing, Inc. ("2-Way") hereby respectfully moves for leave to file portions of the following Motions in Limine, filed contemporaneously herewith, as well as certain exhibits in support of such Motions, under seal:

- (1) 2-Way Computing, Inc.'s Motion In Limine To Preclude Argument Or Evidence Regarding How Plaintiff's Infringement Analysis Would Affect Defendants' Invalidity Analysis
- (2) 2-Way Computing, Inc.'s Motion In Limine To Exclude Defendants' Alleged Prior Art Documents
- (3) 2-Way Computing, Inc.'s Motion In Limine To Preclude Defendants From Arguing Claim Constructions To The Jury
- (4) 2-Way Computing, Inc.'s Motion To Strike Portions Of The Opinions Of Defendants' Damages Expert Catharine Lawton
- (5) 2-Way Computing, Inc.'s Motion Exclude Defendants' Expert Opinions, Argument, And Evidence Regarding Non-Infringing Alternatives

This Motion for Leave is based on the following Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the papers and pleadings on file, and any oral argument the Court may entertain. Additionally, counsel for 2-Way has conferred with counsel for Sprint Solutions, Inc., Nextel Finance Company, Sprint United Management Company, Nextel of California, Inc., Nextel Boost of California, LLC, and Nextel Communications, Inc. (collectively, "Sprint"), who indicated that they do not oppose this Motion.

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. STATEMENT OF FACTS

On May 20, 2011, the Court entered the parties' Stipulated Protective Order. (See Docket No. 39.) On May 24, 2012, the Court entered a Stipulation for Amendment to Stipulated Protective Order. (See Docket No. 99.) The Stipulated Protective Order allows for the production of documents and information that contain business or technical information of a competitive significance. (See Docket No. 39 at ¶ 6.) The Stipulated Protective Order also protects non-parties that provide confidential documents and/or information in the case.

(*Id.* at ¶ 15.) Under the Stipulated Protective Order, the parties, as well as nonparties such as Motorola Mobility, Motorola Solutions, and Qualcomm, produced documents, provided information during discovery, and permitted the parties to produce information and documents subject to confidentiality restrictions. A number of documents and information produced were designated as "Confidential" in accordance with the provisions in the Stipulated Protective Order as the documents or information involved proprietary technical information with respect to the iDEN technology at issue and proprietary financial information with respect to sales of the accused products.

2-Way is now filing the five Motions in Limine listed above. The Motions incorporate materials that either the parties, or non-parties, have deemed "Confidential" under the Stipulated Protective Order. This includes portions of the briefs and certain exhibits to the declarations filed in support of 2-Way's Motions. In accordance with paragraph 9 of the Stipulated Protective Order, 2-Way hereby files the instant motion.

II. LEGAL ARGUMENT AND ANALYSIS

The documents filed under seal should remain sealed because they contain confidential information and trade secrets regarding the technology at issue, competitive information, and financial information that should not be publicly available. The Ninth Circuit has held that there is a strong presumption of public access to judicial records. *See Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006); *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003). A party seeking to file documents under seal bears the burden of overcoming that presumption. *Pintos v. Pac. Creditors Ass'n*, 605 F.3d 665, 678 (9th Cir. 2010) (*quoting Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1178). Parties "who seek to maintain the secrecy of documents attached to dispositive motions must meet the high threshold of showing that 'compelling reasons' support secrecy." *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1180. Those compelling reasons must outweigh the competing interests of the public in having access to the judicial records and understanding the judicial process. *Id.* At 1178-79. The Ninth Circuit has indicated that "compelling reasons" sufficient to outweigh the public's interest in disclosure and justify sealing court records exist when it is appropriate to protect sensitive material, such as a party's proprietary business operations and trade secrets.

See generally id. at 1179. The information 2-Way seeks to maintain under seal meets the "compelling reasons" test.

The information 2-Way seeks to maintain under seal relates to (1) the development and operation of the iDEN system and (2) competitive financial information about Sprint's sale of the accused iDEN products. The information has been designated as "Confidential" under the Stipulated Protective Order because the producing party considers the information to be proprietary and subject to protection. Another district court considered the issue in an unrelated theft of trade secrets case involving documents concerning iDEN technology, and made specific findings of fact that the iDEN technology is proprietary and not readily available to the public. *See U.S. v. Hanjuan Jin*, 833 F. Supp. 2d 977, 982, 993 (N.D. III. 2012).

The following materials relate to the development and operation of the proprietary iDEN technology, including how devices that use such technology operate, and thus should be maintained under seal:

- Exhibit 1 to 2-Way Computing, Inc.'s Motion In Limine To Preclude Argument Or
 Evidence Regarding How Plaintiff's Infringement Analysis Would Affect
 Defendants' Invalidity Analysis
- Exhibit 22 to 2-Way Computing, Inc.'s Motion In Limine To Exclude Defendants'
 Alleged Prior Art Documents
- Exhibit 2 to 2-Way Computing, Inc.'s Motion In Limine To Preclude Defendants
 From Arguing Claim Constructions To The Jury

The following materials relate to confidential financial information regarding Sprint's sales of the accused products, and thus should be maintained under seal:

- Plaintiff 2-Way Computing, Inc.'s Motion To Strike Portions Of The Opinions Of Defendants' Damages Expert Catharine Lawton
- Exhibit C to Plaintiff 2-Way Computing, Inc.'s Motion To Strike Portions Of The Opinions Of Defendants' Damages Expert Catharine Lawton
- Exhibit D to Plaintiff 2-Way Computing, Inc.'s Motion To Strike Portions Of The Opinions Of Defendants' Damages Expert Catharine Lawton

- Exhibit A to Plaintiff 2-Way Computing, Inc.'s Motion Exclude Defendants' Expert Opinions, Argument, And Evidence Regarding Non-Infringing Alternatives
- Exhibit B to Plaintiff 2-Way Computing, Inc.'s Motion Exclude Defendants' Expert Opinions, Argument, And Evidence Regarding Non-Infringing Alternatives
- Exhibit E to Plaintiff 2-Way Computing, Inc.'s Motion Exclude Defendants' Expert Opinions, Argument, And Evidence Regarding Non-Infringing Alternatives

Due to the confidential, proprietary, and private nature of these documents and information, public disclosure could result in improper use and could put not only Defendant Sprint, but also non-parties, at a competitive disadvantage in the marketplace.

Considering the information at issue, there is comparatively little value to the general public in terms of enhancing its "understanding of the judicial process." *See Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179. Therefore, there is no harm to the public if this proprietary information is not publically accessible. Accordingly, this Court should enter an order to seal the documents and information and not place it on the Court's docket.

III. CONCLUSION

The exhibits and redacted portions of 2-Way's Motions in Limine contain confidential information and trade secrets regarding the technology used by Sprint for Push-to-Talk, as well as confidential financial information regarding Sprint's sales of the accused products. Thus, 2-Way respectfully requests that the Court enter an Order granting this unopposed motion for these materials to remain sealed.

Case 2:11-cv-00012-JCM-PAL Document 295 Filed 08/20/15 Page 6 of 10 Dated: July 24, 2015 Respectfully submitted, By: /s/ Reza Mirzaie Reza Mirzaie Marc A. Fenster Adam S. Hoffman Shani M. Tutt Brian D. Ledahl Jay C. Chung RUSS, AUGUST & KABAT 12424 Wilshire Boulevard, 12th Floor Los Angeles, California 90025 Mark Borghese BORGHESE LEGAL, LTD.

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE		
2	The undersigned hereby certifies that on July 24, 2015, I presented the within 2-WAY		
3	COMPUTING, INC.'S UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE UNDER		
4	SEAL to the Clerk of Court for filing and uploading to the ECF system which will send		
5	notification to the following:		
6	Kelly H Dove		
7	Email: kdove@swlaw.com Brian R. Reeve		
8	Email: breeve@swlaw.com Chad R. Fears		
9	Email: cfears@swlaw.com Greg Bower		
10	Email: gbrower@swlaw.com SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.		
11	3883 Howard Hughes Parkway Las Vegas, NV 89169		
12	Tel: (702) 784-5200 Fax: (702) 784-5252		
13	William H. Boice		
	Email: bboice@kilpatricktownsend.com		
14	Steven D. Moore Email smoore@kilpatricktownsend.com		
15	Matthew M. Lubozynski Email: mlubozynski@kilpatricktownsend.com		
16	Kristopher L. Reed		
17	Email: kreed@kilpatricktownsend.com Christopher Schenck		
1/	Email: cschenck@kilpatricktownsend.com		
18	K James Sangston		
19	Email: jsangston@kilpatricktownsend.com KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP		
20	1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800 Atlanta, GA 30309-4528		
21	Tel: (404) 815-6500 Fax: (404) 815-6555		
22			
23			
24	<u>/s/ Reza Mirzaie</u> Reza Mirzaie		
25	RCZa WIIIZaiC		
26			
27			
28			
40			

ı		
1	Reza Mirzaie (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)	
	<u>rmirzaie@raklaw.com</u> Marc A. Fenster (<i>Admitted Pro Hac Vice</i>)	
2	mfenster@raklaw.com	
3	Adam S. Hoffman (Admitted Pro Hac Vice) ahoffman@raklaw.com	
4	Shani M. Tutt (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)	
5	stutt@raklaw. <i>com</i> Brian D. Ledahl (<i>Admitted Pro Hac Vice</i>)	
	<u>bledahl@raklaw.com</u> C. Jay Chung (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)	
6	jchung@raklaw.com	
7	RUSS, AUGUST & KABAT 12424 Wilshire Boulevard, 12th Floor	
8	Los Angeles, California 90025 Telephone: (310) 826-7474	
9	Facsimile: (310) 826-6991	
10	Mark Borghese	
11	Nevada Bar No. 6231 mark@borgheselegal.com	
12	BORGHESE LEGAL, LTD.	
13	10161 Park Run Drive, Suite 150 Las Vegas, NV 89145	
	Telephone: (702) 382-0200 Facsimile: (702) 382-0212	
14	·	
15	Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counterdefendant, 2-WAY COMPUTING, INC.	
16	IN THE UNITED STAT	TES DISTRICT COURT
17		ICT OF NEVADA
	2-WAY COMPUTING, INC., a Nevada	Case No.: 2:11-cv-00012-JCM-(PAL)
18	corporation, Plaintiff,	[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
19	V.	2-WAY COMPUTING, INC.'S
20	NEXTEL FINANCE COMPANY, a	UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE UNDER SEAL
$_{21}$	Delaware corporation; SPRINT UNITED	
22	MANAGEMENT COMPANY, a Kansas corporation; SPRINT SOLUTIONS, INC., a	
	Delaware corporation, NEXTEL OF CALIFORNIA, INC., a Delaware	
23	corporation, NEXTEL BOOST OF	
24	CALIFORNIA, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, and NEXTEL	
25	COMMUNICATIONS, INC., a Delaware	
26	corporation, Defendants.	
2 <i>7</i>		

1 CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 2 The undersigned hereby certifies that on July 24, 2015, I presented the within 3 [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING 2-WAY COMPUTING, INC.'S UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE UNDER SEAL to the Clerk of Court for filing and 4 5 uploading to the ECF system which will send notification to the following: 6 Kelly H Dove 7 Email: kdove@swlaw.com Brian R. Reeve 8 Email: breeve@swlaw.com Chad R. Fears 9 Email: cfears@swlaw.com Greg Bower 10 Email: gbrower@swlaw.com SNELL & WILMER L.L.P. 11 3883 Howard Hughes Parkway Las Vegas, NV 89169 12 Tel: (702) 784-5200 Fax: (702) 784-5252 13 William H. Boice 14 Email: bboice@kilpatricktownsend.com Steven D. Moore 15 Email smoore@kilpatricktownsend.com Matthew M. Lubozynski 16 Email: mlubozynski@kilpatricktownsend.com Kristopher L. Reed 17 Email: kreed@kilpatricktownsend.com Christopher Schenck 18 Email: cschenck@kilpatricktownsend.com K James Sangston 19 Email: jsangston@kilpatricktownsend.com KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP 20 1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800 Atlanta, GA 30309-4528 21 Tel: (404) 815-6500 Fax: (404) 815-6555 22 23 24 /s/ Reza Mirzaie Reza Mirzaie 25 26 27

28